

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD.

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION No 533 of 1996

For Approval and Signature :

Hon'ble MR. JUSTICE S.K.KESHOTE

-
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

KANUBHAI S GOHIL
VERSUS
DR. CHITRALAKHA DAVE

Appearance:

MR HJ TRIVEDI for Petitioner
MR JT TRIVEDI for Respondent No.1
None present for Respondent NO.2
MR SB PARIKH for MR RH MEHTA for Respondent No.3

CORAM : MR JUSTICE S.K. KESHOTE
Date of Decision : 16/03/2000

C.A.V. JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The order passed by the court below is perfectly legal and justified to which no interference is called for. Kanubhai S. Gohil, guardian and next friend of minor Andrew K Gohil is a practising advocate. He is not only an advocate but the father of this minor and in case he filed the suit for damages, the father should have paid the court fees. It is really shocking that an advocate instead of paying the court fees in a suit filed by him as a guardian and next friend of his minor son is raising all these objections. It is wholly a frivolous revision application by none other than an advocate.

In the result, this revision application fails and the same is dismissed. Rule discharged. Interim relief, if any, granted by this court stands vacated. No order as to costs.

zgs/-